



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,358	04/12/2004	Ali Shajii	56231-457 (MKS-143)	3068
7590	09/20/2007	Toby H. Kusmer McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 28 State Street Boston, MA 02109	EXAMINER ZERVIGON, RUDY	
			ART UNIT 1763	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/822,358	SHAJII ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rudy Zervigon	1763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 21-30 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 21-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-8, and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashley; Ethan (US 5,565,038 A) in view of Nawata, Tokuhide et al. (US 20040244837 A1).
Ashley teaches a system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) for delivering a desired mass of gas (1; Figure 1), comprising: a chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); a first valve (4; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) controlling gas (1; Figure 1) flow into the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); a second valve (13/14; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) controlling gas (1; Figure 1) flow out of the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); a pressure transducer ("PS8"; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) providing measurements of pressure within the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); a controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) connected to the valves and the pressure transducer ("PS8"; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) wherein the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) is configured and arranged to, receive a desired mass flow setpoint (column 9; lines 1-20) from an input device (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67 = compare to applicant's specification [0031]), close the second valve (13/14; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16); open the first valve (4; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16); receive chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) pressure measurements from the pressure transducer ("PS8"; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); close the first valve (4; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) when pressure within the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) reaches a predetermined level; wait a predetermined waiting period to allow the gas (1; Figure 1) inside the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27).

Art Unit: 1763

1; column 8, lines 17-27) to approach a state of equilibrium; open the second valve (13/14; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) at time=t₀; calculate a value of the total mass delivered as the second valve (13/14; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) is open and as a function of a temperature and pressure within the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); and close the second valve (13/14; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) at time=t* when the calculated value of total mass delivered equals the desired mass flow setpoint (column 9; lines 1-20) – claim 1

Ashley further teaches:

- i. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 1, wherein the mass delivered .DELTA.m at time t* is equal to, $.DELTA.m = m(t_0) - m(t^*) = V/R[(P(t_0)/T(t_0)) - (P(t^*)/T(-t^*))]$ (5) wherein m(t₀) is the mass of the gas (1; Figure 1) in the delivery chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time=t₀, when the gas inside the chamber is at a state of equilibrium, m(t^{*}) is the mass of the gas (1; Figure 1) in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time=t*, V is the volume of the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), R is equal to the ideal gas (1; Figure 1) constant (8.3145 J/mol K), P(t₀) is the pressure in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time=t₀, P(t^{*}) is the pressure in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time=t*, T(t₀) is the temperature in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time=t₀, T(t^{*}) is the temperature in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time=t*, as claimed by claim 2
- ii. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 2, further comprising a temperature probe (“TS9”; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) secured to the delivery chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) and connected to the controller (20; Figure

- 1; column 8, lines 17-67), wherein the temperature probe (“TS9”; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) directly provides $T(t_0)$ and $T(t^*)$ to the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67), as claimed by claim 3
- iii. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 3, wherein the chamber includes a chamber wall, and wherein $T(t_0)$ and $T(t^*)$ are calculated by the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) using: $dT/dt = (\rho_{sub,STP}/\rho_{sub,V})Q_{sub,out}(\gamma - 1)T + (Nu \cdot \kappa/l)(A_{sub,w}/V - C_{sub,v}\rho_{sub,V}) \cdot sub,w - T)^{(3)}$ where $\rho_{sub,STP}$ is the gas (1; Figure 1) density under standard temperature and pressure (STP) conditions, $\rho_{sub,V}$ equals the density of the gas (1; Figure 1), V is the volume of the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), $Q_{sub,out}$ is the gas (1; Figure 1) flow out of the delivery chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), T equals absolute temperature, γ is the ratio of specific heats, Nu is Nusselt's number, κ is the thermal conductivity of the gas (1; Figure 1), $C_{sub,v}$ is the specific heat of the gas (1; Figure 1) under constant volume, l is the characteristic length of the delivery chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), and $T_{sub,w}$ is the temperature of the wall of the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) as provided by the temperature probe (“TS9”; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), as claimed by claim 4
- iv. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 4, wherein the gas (1; Figure 1) flow out of the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) is calculated using: $Q_{sub,out} = -(V/\rho_{sub,STP})[(1/RT)(d\rho/dT) - (P/RT)^{1.5}(dT/dT)] \quad (4)$, as claimed by claim 5

- v. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 1, wherein the value of the predetermined level of pressure is provided through the input device (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67 = compare to applicant's specification [0031]), as claimed by claim 6
- vi. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 1, wherein the value of the predetermined waiting period is provided through the input device (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67 = compare to applicant's specification [0031]), as claimed by claim 7
- vii. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 1, further comprising an output device (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67 = compare to applicant's specification [0031]) connected to the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) and wherein the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) is configured and arranged so as to provide to the output device (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67 = compare to applicant's specification [0031]) an indication of the mass delivered, as claimed by claim 8
- viii. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) for delivering a desired quantity of mass of gas (1; Figure 1), comprising: a chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) including an inlet (inlet to chamber 7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) and outlet (outlet from chamber 7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); an inlet valve (4; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16), connected to the inlet (inlet to chamber 7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), configured and arranged so as to control the flow of gas (1; Figure 1) into the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) through the inlet (inlet to chamber 7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); an outlet valve (13/14; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16), connected to the

- outlet (outlet from chamber 7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), configured and arranged so as to control the flow of gas (1; Figure 1) from the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) through the outlet (outlet from chamber 7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); and a controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) configured and arranged to control the inlet and outlet valves so that (a) gas (1; Figure 1) can flow into the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) until the pressure (as measured from PS8; Figure 1) within the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) reaches a predetermined level, b) the pressure (as measured from PS8; Figure 1) of gas (1; Figure 1) within the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) can reach a state of equilibrium, and c) a controlled amount of mass of the gas (1; Figure 1) can then be measured and allowed to flow from the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) as a function of a setpoint (column 9; lines 1-20) corresponding to a desired mass (*mass* flow controller; 4; Figure 1), and the temperature (as measured from TS9; Figure 1) and pressure (as measured from PS8; Figure 1) in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), as claimed by claim 21
- ix. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 21, further including a pressure sensor (“PS8”; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) constructed and arranged so as to provide a pressure (as measured from PS8; Figure 1) measurement signal (via 20) to the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) as a function of the pressure (as measured from PS8; Figure 1) within the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), and a temperature sensor (“TS9”; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) constructed and arranged so as to provide a temperature (as measured from TS9; Figure 1) measurement signal (via 20) to the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) as a function of the

temperature (as measured from TS9; Figure 1) within the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), as claimed by claim 22

- x. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 21, wherein the amount of mass of gas (1; Figure 1) flowing from the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), Δm at time t^* , is determined by the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) as follows: {}, wherein $m(t^*)$ is the mass of the gas (1; Figure 1) in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time = to when the gas (1; Figure 1) within the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) is at a state of equilibrium, $m(t^*)$ is the mass of the gas (1; Figure 1) in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time = t^* , V is the volume of the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), R is equal to the ideal gas (1; Figure 1) constant, $P(to)$ is the pressure (as measured from PS8; Figure 1) in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time = to, $P(t^*)$ is the pressure (as measured from PS8; Figure 1) in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time = t^* , $T(to)$ is the temperature (as measured from TS9; Figure 1) in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time = to, $T(t^*)$ is the temperature (as measured from TS9; Figure 1) in the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) at time t^* , as claimed by claim 23
- xi. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 21, wherein the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) is further configured and arranged to control operation of the inlet valve (4; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) by control commands (column 9), as claimed by claim 24
- xii. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 21, wherein the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) includes a chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27)

wall, and further comprising a temperature sensor (“TS9”; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) configured and arranged to sense a temperature (as measured from TS9; Figure 1) of the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) wall Tw, and produce a corresponding temperature (as measured from TS9; Figure 1) signal, and wherein T(to) and T(t*) are the measured temperatures of the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) wall at times to and t*, respectively, as claimed by claim 25

Ashley is not specific in teaching the operation of his valves with respect to the computer logic and processing claimed in claims 1-8, 21-26:

- i. A system (Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-65) according to claim 25, wherein the controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) is configured and arranged so that a controlled amount of mass of the gas (1; Figure 1) can be allowed to flow from the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) as a function time derivative of the temperature (as measured from TS9; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 26

Nawata is discussed below. In particular, Nawata teaches mass flow control based on equations of state ([0130]-[0111]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the operation of Ashley’s controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) as taught by Nawata.

Motivation to optimize the operation of Ashley’s controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) as taught by Nawata is for optimizing the operation of Ashley’s apparatus as taught by Ashley (column 8, lines 65-67) and for prevention of line clogging as taught by Nawata ([0038]). Further, it would be obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the operation of the

Art Unit: 1763

claimed invention (In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980); In re Hoeschele , 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969); Merck & Co. Inc . v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc. , 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied , 493 U.S. 975 (1989); In re Kulling , 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990), MPEP 2144.05).

3. Claims 1-10, 21-26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nawata, Tokuhide et al. (US 20040244837 A1). Nawata teaches a system (Figure 1) for delivering a desired mass of gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1), comprising: a chamber (13; Figure 1); a first valve (12; Figure 1) controlling gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) flow into the chamber (13; Figure 1); a second valve (17; Figure 1) controlling gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) flow out of the chamber (13; Figure 1); a pressure transducer (14; Figure 1) providing measurements of pressure within the chamber (13; Figure 1); an input device (19; Figure 1) for providing a desired mass of gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) to be delivered from the system (Figure 1); a controller (19; Figure 1) connected to the valves, the pressure transducer (14; Figure 1) and the input device (19; Figure 1) and programmed to, receive the desired mass of gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) through the input device (19; Figure 1), close the second valve (17; Figure 1); open the first valve (12; Figure 1); receive chamber (13; Figure 1) pressure measurements from the pressure transducer (14; Figure 1); close the first valve when pressure within the chamber (13; Figure 1) reaches a predetermined level; wait a predetermined waiting period to allow the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) inside the chamber (13; Figure 1) to approach a state of equilibrium; open the second valve at time=t₀; and close the

second valve at time=t* when the mass of gas ("from process gas source"; Figure 1) discharged equals the desired mass – claim 1

Nawata further teaches:

- xiii. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 1, wherein the mass discharged .DELTA.m is equal to, $.DELTA.m = m(t_0) - m(t^*) = V/R[(P(t_0)/T(t_0)) - (P(t^*)/T(-t^*))]$ (5) wherein $m(t_0)$ is the mass of the gas ("from process gas source"; Figure 1) in the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1) at time=t₀, $m(t^*)$ is the mass of the gas ("from process gas source"; Figure 1) in the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1) at time=t*, V is the volume of the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1), R is equal to the universal gas ("from process gas source"; Figure 1) constant (8.3145 J/mol K), $P(t_0)$ is the pressure in the chamber (13; Figure 1) at time=t₀, $P(t^*)$ is the pressure in the chamber (13; Figure 1) at time=t*, $T(t_0)$ is the temperature in the chamber (13; Figure 1) at time=t₀, $T(t^*)$ is the temperature in the chamber (13; Figure 1) at time=t*, as claimed by claim 2
- xiv. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 2, further comprising a temperature probe (15; Figure 1) secured to the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1) and connected to the controller (19; Figure 1), wherein the temperature probe (15; Figure 1) directly provides $T(t_0)$ and $T(t^*)$ to the controller (19; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 3
- xv. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 3, further comprising a temperature probe (15; Figure 1) secured to the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1) and connected to the controller (19; Figure 1) and wherein $T(t_0)$ and $T(t^*)$ are calculated using:
$$dT/dt = (\rho_{sub,STP}/\rho_{sub,V})Q_{sub,out}(\gamma - 1)T + (\kappa_{sub}/l)(A_{sub,w}/V - \rho_{sub,v}\rho_{sub,w} - T) \quad (3)$$
 where $\rho_{sub,STP}$ is the gas ("from process gas source";

Figure 1) density under standard temperature and pressure (STP) conditions, .rho. equals the density of the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1), V is the volume of the chamber (13; Figure 1), Q.sub.out is the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) flow out of the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1), T equals absolute temperature, .gamma. is the ratio of specific heats, Nu is Nusslets number, .kappa. is the thermal conductivity of the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1), C.sub.v is the specific heat of the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) under constant volume, l is the characteristic length of the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1), and T.sub.w is the temperature of the wall of the chamber (13; Figure 1) as provided by the temperature probe (15; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 4

- xvi. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 4, wherein the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) flow out of the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1) is calculated using: $Q.\text{sub.out} = (V.\rho.\text{sub.STP})[(1/RT)(d.\rho./dt) - (P/RT)^2(dT/dt)]$ (4), as claimed by claim 5
- xvii. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 1, wherein the predetermined level of pressure is provided through the input device (19; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 6
- xviii. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 1, wherein the predetermined waiting period is provided through the input device (19; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 7
- xix. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 1, further comprising an output device (19; Figure 1) connected to the controller (19; Figure 1) and the controller (19; Figure 1) is programmed to provide the mass of gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) discharged to the output device (19; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 8

- xx. a system (Figure 1) according to claim 1, wherein the chamber is a delivery chamber further comprising a process chamber (“tovacuum vessel”; Figure 1) connected to the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1) through the second valve (17; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 9
- xxi. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 1, wherein the pressure transducer (14; Figure 1) has a response time of about 1 to 5 milliseconds ([0114]), as claimed by claim 10
- xxii. A system (Figure 1) for delivering a desired quantity of mass of gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1), comprising: a chamber (13; Figure 1) including an inlet (inlet to chamber 13; Figure 1) and outlet (outlet from chamber 13; Figure 1); an inlet valve (12; Figure 1), connected to the inlet (inlet to chamber 13; Figure 1), configured and arranged so as to control the flow of gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) into the chamber (13; Figure 1) through the inlet (inlet to chamber 13; Figure 1); an outlet valve (17; Figure 1), connected to the outlet (outlet from chamber 13; Figure 1), configured and arranged so as to control the flow of gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) from the chamber (13; Figure 1) through the outlet (outlet from chamber 13; Figure 1); and a controller (19; Figure 1) configured and arranged to control the inlet and outlet valves so that (a) gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) can flow into the chamber (13; Figure 1) until the pressure (as measured from 14; Figure 1) within the chamber (13; Figure 1) reaches a predetermined level, b) the pressure (as measured from 14; Figure 1) of gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) within the chamber (13; Figure 1) can reach a state of equilibrium, and c) a controlled amount of mass of the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) can then be measured and allowed to flow from the chamber (13;

- Figure 1) as a function of a setpoint (“predetermined value”; [0013]) corresponding to a desired mass , and the temperature (as measured from 15; Figure 1) and pressure (as measured from 14; Figure 1) in the chamber (13; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 21
- xxiii. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 21, further including a pressure sensor (14; Figure 1) constructed and arranged so as to provide a pressure (as measured from 14; Figure 1) measurement signal (via 19) to the controller (19; Figure 1) as a function of the pressure (as measured from 14; Figure 1) within the chamber (13; Figure 1), and a temperature sensor (“TS9”; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) constructed and arranged so as to provide a temperature (as measured from 15; Figure 1) measurement signal (via 19) to the controller (19; Figure 1) as a function of the temperature (as measured from 15; Figure 1) within the chamber (13; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 22
- xxiv. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 21, wherein the amount of mass of gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) flowing from the chamber (13; Figure 1), delta m at time t*, is determined by the controller (19; Figure 1) as follows: {}, wherein $m(t^*)$ is the mass of the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) in the chamber (13; Figure 1) at time = to when the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) within the chamber (13; Figure 1) is at a state of equilibrium, $m(t^*)$ is the mass of the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) in the chamber (13; Figure 1) at time = t^* , V is the volume of the chamber (13; Figure 1), R is equal to the ideal gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) constant, $P(t_0)$ is the pressure (as measured from 14; Figure 1) in the chamber (13; Figure 1) at time = t_0 , $P(t^*)$ is the pressure (as measured from 14; Figure 1) in the chamber (13; Figure 1) at time = t^* , $T(t_0)$ is the temperature (as measured from 15; Figure 1) in the

chamber (13; Figure 1) at time = t_0 , $T(t^*)$ is the temperature (as measured from 15; Figure 1) in the chamber (13; Figure 1) at time t^* , as claimed by claim 23

- xxv. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 21, wherein the controller (19; Figure 1) is further configured and arranged to control operation of the inlet valve (12; Figure 1) by control commands ([0013]), as claimed by claim 24
- xxvi. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 21, wherein the chamber (13; Figure 1) includes a chamber (13; Figure 1) wall, and further comprising a temperature sensor (“TS9”; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27) configured and arranged to sense a temperature (as measured from 15; Figure 1) of the chamber (13; Figure 1) wall T_w , and produce a corresponding temperature (as measured from 15; Figure 1) signal, and wherein $T(t_0)$ and $T(t^*)$ are the measured temperatures of the chamber (13; Figure 1) wall at times t_0 and t^* , respectively, as claimed by claim 25
- xxvii. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 21, wherein the chamber (13; Figure 1) is a delivery chamber (13; Figure 1), and further comprising a process chamber (“To Vacuum Vessel”; Figure 1) connected to the delivery chamber (13; Figure 1) through the outlet valve (17; Figure 1), as claimed by claim 30

Nawata is not specific in teaching the operation of his valves with respect to the computer logic and processing claimed in claims 1-8, and 21-29:

- i. A system (Figure 1) according to claim 25, wherein the first valve (12; Figure 1) is configured and arranged so that a controlled amount of mass of the gas (“from process gas source”; Figure 1) can be allowed to flow from the chamber (13; Figure 1) as a

function time derivative of the temperature (as measured from 15; Figure 1) {}, as claimed by claim 26

In the event that Nawata is not deemed to anticipate Applicant's claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the operation of the claimed apparatus.

Motivation to optimize the operation of the claimed apparatus is for prevention of line clogging as taught by Nawata ([0038]). Further, it would be obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the operation of the claimed invention (In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980); In re Hoeschele , 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969); Merck & Co. Inc . v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc. , 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied , 493 U.S. 975 (1989); In re Kulling , 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990), MPEP 2144.05).

4. Claims 11, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawata, Tokuhide et al. (US 20040244837 A1) in view of Ohmi; Tadahiro et al. (US 6193212 B1). Nawata is discussed above. Nawata does not teach that his second valve (17; Figure 1) has a response time of about 1 to 5 milliseconds. Ohmi teaches a fluid delivery valve (Figure 1) with a response time of "a few milliseconds" (column 3; lines 24-33; Table 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace Nawata's second valve (17; Figure 1) with Ohmi's fluid delivery valve.

Motivation to replace Nawata's second valve (17; Figure 1) with Ohmi's fluid delivery valve is for preventing counter flow as taught by Nawata (column 2; lines 48-61).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed July 2, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. Applicant states both in the July 2, 2007 response and the December 12, 2006 response:

“

The systems and methods of Ashley require enough lime so that the interhalogen gases used can travel to and etch away the accumulated films. Further, the systems and methods of Ashley operate on a time scale that is greater than that of the claimed systems and methods by orders of magnitude. This is verified by Ashley, e.g., in describing the preferred embodiment as occurring over a period of minutes. See. e.g., Ashley, col. 9, lines 8-9 and 45-47. Consequently, a thermal mass flow controller as taught by Ashley is not capable of measuring a short burst of flow from a quick on/off cycle of a valve.

“

The Examiner thus repeats and reasserts his position as stated in the prior action: In response, the Examiner notes that the “methods” of Asheley’s apparatus, and the presently claimed apparatus, are demonstrated to have structural, and thus functional equivalence. Thus, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); MPEP 2112.01).

With respect to Applicant’s position that “Ashley operate on a time scale that is greater than that of the claimed systems and methods by orders of magnitude” because “a thermal mass flow controller as taught by Ashley is not capable of measuring a short burst of flow from a quick

Art Unit: 1763

on/off cycle of a valve”, the Examiner notes that “a short burst” is a relative term and may, depending on Applicant’s definition thereof support the structural and functional equivalents in Ashley.

Further, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant repeats his December 12, 2006 argument (page 10 of July 2, 2007):

“

The system and method of Nawata, however, measure the volume flow Q of gas exhausted from a cutoffvalve based on a difference in pressures within a delivery chamber after the inlet valve is closed, and again after the outlet valve is closed, i.e., at the beginning and end of the delivery process. See Nawata, paragraph [0060]. Measurements are made only after a particular gas flow delivery process (or pulse shot) has been completed. See Nawata, paragraph [0061].

“

7. In response, again, the Examiner reasserts his positions, and with respect to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., “Measurements are made only after a particular gas flow delivery process (or pulse shot) has been completed”) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant's claims do not exclude the method of data collection as detailed by Nawata. In particular, the Examiner does not see how Nawata's method of data collection is excluded from the claimed method as the Examiner has addressed above in his rejections under Nawata.

With respect to Ashley, the Examiner emphasizes that Ashley indeed teaches a controller (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67) is configured and arranged to, receive a desired mass flow setpoint (column 9; lines 1-20) from an input device (20; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-67 = compare to applicant's specification [0031]) as substantially claimed. The specific control logic as detailed in the Examiner's rejection is met according to the Nawata teachings of a mass flow control based on equations of state ([0130]-[0111]) – see above.

8. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Examiner has provided teaching, suggestion, and motivation for combining the references (see above) where each of the teaching, suggestion, and motivation is drawn directly from the references themselves (see above).

9. Applicant states with respect to Ashley:

"

there is no description or suggestion in Ashley of all of the limitations as arranged in claims 1 and 21 of the subject application, e.g. "a controller that is configured and arranged to "(vii) open

Art Unit: 1763

the second valve at time = t_0 ; (viii) calculate a value of the total mass delivered as the second valve is open and as a function of temperature and pressure within the chamber; and (ix) close the second valve at time = t^* when the calculated value of total mass delivered equals the desired mass flow setpoint," e.g., as claimed in Applicant's claim 1

"

and...

"

The Applicants' claimed systems operate in a fundamentally different manner than the system of Nawata by measuring the mass of gas as it is delivered from the chamber through the outlet valve, with the controller closing the outlet valve at the time the controller determines that the desired amount of mass of gas is delivered. The Applicants' systems consequently automatically compensate for varying charge pressures, downstream pressures (which affect flow out of the delivery chamber), and orifice geometries and timing characteristics of the inlet and outlet valves, while still delivering a desired quantity of gaseous mass.

"

and...

"

Thus, Ashley does not teach using pressure and temperature measurements to calculate a desired mass and closing an output/second valve at a calculated time and because of this shortcoming actually teaches away from the limitations as recited in independent claims 1 and 21 of the subject application

"

In response, the Examiner remains convinced that Ashley indeed teaches opening the second valve (13/14; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) at time=t₀; calculate a value of the total mass delivered as the second valve (13/14; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) is open and as a function of a temperature and pressure within the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27); and close the second valve (13/14; Figure 1; column 8, lines 1-16) at time=t* when the calculated value of total mass delivered equals the desired mass flow setpoint (column 9; lines 1-20). Applicant's mass setpoint for the chamber is directly analogous to Ashley's measured "desired pressure" and measured temperature (TS9) for the chamber (7; Figure 1; column 8, lines 17-27), further, those of ordinary skill in the art would know such a conversion between mass and pressure by the ideal gas law as supported by Nawata ([0130]-[0111]):

$$\begin{aligned} P_{SetPo\ int} V_{SetPo\ int} &= nRT \\ P_{SetPo\ int} \left(\frac{m_{SetPo\ int}}{\rho} \right) &= nRT \\ m_{SetPo\ int} &= \frac{nRT\rho}{P_{SetPo\ int}} \end{aligned}$$

Applicant states:

"

Applicant further notes that valve 3 of Ashley is a gas inlet pneumatic valve and not a second (outlet) valve as claimed by Applicant.

"

In response, nowhere in the Examiner's action does he employ Ashley's valve 3 against *any* corresponding element claimed.

10. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the

teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Examiner has provided teaching, suggestion, and motivation for combining the references (see above) where each of the teaching, suggestion, and motivation is drawn directly from the references themselves (see above).

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1442. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am

Art Unit: 1763

through 7pm. The official fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (571) 273-8300. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (571) 272-1700. If the examiner can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh, at (571) 272-1435.


Parviz Hassanzadeh